Amendments to the Drawings

All 20 sheets of drawings have been replaced with 17 sheets of formal drawings, consolidating some of the smaller figures. No new matter is added in these drawings, which have been re-drafted to mirror the previous drawings as closely as possible.

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-41 remain pending in the application. By this paper, claims 1, 22, and 28 have been amended to provide clarity. Replacement sheets of all drawing figures are submitted. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in light of the amendments and arguments herein is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 132

The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §132 for introducing new matter into the disclosure and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement upon amending claim 1 to read "an unspecified visual format." Without conceding that the disputed language is not taught in the disclosure, the Applicants have amended the language to read "any of a plurality of formats," which perhaps more accurately describes what is taught. For instance, the middle two paragraphs of page 3 discuss the disadvantages of "standardization" of ad formats. The disclosure teaches a solution to this problem in "that the present invention is able to enhance banner ads (***or any other content***) of any dimension, including standard banner ad sizes, in real time at the client system 12." (emphasis added) This makes clear that the system and method described in the application is designed to enhance any format of content. Accordingly, the amended language is taught in the disclosure, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-8, 10-13, 16-27, and 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,379,251 (Auxier) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,826,594 (Petterson). The Applicants respectfully submit that these references, alone or combined, do not teach each and every element of the claims.

As amended, claim 1 recites:

> an enhancement module for altering an output format of the content object, wherein the enhancement module rearranges image data of the content object, and wherein the enhancement module operates on content objects having any of a plurality of formats.

Claim 33 recites "executing the enhancement module such that image data from the content object is rearranged." The Office Action points to Pettersen, column 11, lines 14-31, for teaching an enhancement module that rearranges image data of loaded or retrieved content objects. The Applicants respectfully disagree. Pettersen teaches that different types of dynamic content might be downloaded for display, e.g. image-based and embedded Java® applets, flash files, etc., or that dynamic content may include a portion of a web-page. It then states that:

> the dynamic content might also alter the display characteristics of static content embedded within the web page. For example, the dynamic content might rearrange or reformat such static content.

This passage, therefore, clearly distinguishes static content from active content, and it is the dynamic content that rearranges or reformats static content. In other words, the only thing taught that is rearranged or reformatted is the static web page.

Applicant's disclosure also similarly distinguishes in stating that:

> Content 18 comprises one or more content objects 19, and may include any type of information typically displayed or output over the web. In general, content 18 comprises objects that reside and are served separately from the web (i.e., network) resources 20. In the exemplary embodiment described herein, content 18 is comprised of banner ads and the web resources 20 comprise web pages.

Accordingly, drawing a parallel, content 18 is analogous to dynamic content of Pettersen, and a network resource 20 is analogous to static content, or the web page. Again, it is the static web page that is rearranged or reformatted in Pettersen. In contrast, it is the image data of content objects 19 (e.g. dynamic content) that is rearranged in claims 1 and 33. The difference is clear, and therefore, Pattersen fails to teach rearranging image data from content objects. For at least this reason claims 1 and 33 are patentable over Auxier in view of

Pattersen. Likewise, claims 2-21 and 34-41 are believed to be patentable by virtue of their dependency from claims 1 and 33, respectively.

Claim 22 recites "an enhancement module selected from a plurality of enhancement modules, wherein each enhancement module causes a different visual alteration of the loaded content object." The Office Action points to Pettersen, column 11, lines 40-67, for this teaching. This paragraph, however, recites a laundry list of types of possible dynamic content that may be inserted into a web page at various times, in addition to revenue links insertable within dynamic content.

While Pettersen teaches that "the nature and character of the potential revenue links contained in these varying web pages 793 might be dynamically changed," it does not teach "wherein each enhancement module causes a different visual alternation of the loaded content object." This is because the very next sentence in Pettersen teaches "[f]or example, the revenue links might be displayed as banner ads one time, and as buttons or hyperlinks another time, or at different times of day." This teaches against claim 22 which requires "a different visual alternation of the ***loaded*** content object," not a different content object at another time. In other words, claim 22 (as amended for clarity) requires a content object to be loaded for viewing and then the enhancement that occurs is to provide a different visual alternation of the loaded content. Many examples of this are supplied in the application in FIGS. 7 to 13 and pages 12 and 13 (e.g., formation of a banner ad into a jigsaw puzzle, a breakout of the ad into bricks that may be removed by a ball, or a maze overlaying the loaded banner ad, ect.).

Claim 28 recites a similar limitation to claim 22 and is patentable for at least the same reason. Claims 23-27 and 29-32 are believed to also be patentable by virtue of their dependency from claims 22 and 28, respectively.

With this response, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the examiner deem a telephone conference to be of assistance in advancing the application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the below telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan O. Greene/
Nathan O. Greene
Registration No. 56,956
Attorney for Applicants

May 21, 2007
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(801) 355-7900 x1594